

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-17, 19-20, and 22-23 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 8, and 15 being the only independent claims.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-9, 13, 15-17, 19-20, and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,786,897 (Takanashi).

Claims 5, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Takanashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,933,923 (Feinstein).

Independent claim 1 recites “changing, in accordance with the determined relation, the location of the cursor and the part of the virtual view on the display during the user scrolling actions, whereby the cursor location provides, to a user, navigation information for scrolling the virtual view”.

The above-cited limitation of independent claim 1 requires that both the cursor and the part of the virtual view on the display are changed during user scrolling actions in accordance with the determined relation. The determined relation is defined in independent claim 1 as “a relation between the cursor location on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view.”

MPEP §2131 states that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Takanashi fails to disclose the above limitations because Takanashi fails to disclose that the part of the virtual view on the display is changed during user scrolling actions. According to Takanashi, a window area 5 on a logical screen 4 is displayed in a view port 2 on a physical screen 1 (see col. 1, lines 56-59; and Fig. 1A of Takanashi). An operation menu 3 with a jumpscroll-icon 3' is also shown on the screen 1 (see col. 1, lines 59-61). When a user wishes to view a different part of the virtual screen 4, the user selects the jumpscroll-icon 3' (col. 1, lines 61-65). In response to the selection of the jumpscroll-icon 3', the display screen changes to the state shown in Fig. 1B, in which a rectangle corresponding to logical screen 4 is displayed in the view port 2 with the area 5 displayed as a rectangle 7 (see col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 4). To move the window area 5 to a new location, the user moves rectangle 7 to a position 9 in Fig. 1C (see col. 2, lines 4-9). When the operation menu is selected in the state of Fig. 1C, i.e., with the rectangle 7 moved to position 9, a new window area 5' of logical screen 4, which corresponds to position 9, is displayed in the view port 2 of the screen 1.

Accordingly, Takanashi teaches that when the user is selecting a new position 9, the window screen 5, 5' of the logical screen 4 is not shown. Rather, Takanshi discloses two states: a first state in which a window area 5, 5' of the logical screen 4 is displayed; and a second state in which a rectangle 6 representing logical screen 4 and another rectangle 7, 9 representing a portion of logical screen 4 are displayed. Since the window area 5, 5' is not displayed while a user is moving rectangle 7, 9 within the rectangle 6, Takanashi fails to teach or suggest “changing, in accordance with the determined relation, the location of the cursor and the part of the virtual view on the display during the user scrolling actions, whereby the cursor location provides, to a user, navigation information for scrolling the virtual view”, as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Takanashi and the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

In the rejection of independent claim 1, the Examiner, in the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, infers that the claimed “determined relation” is disclosed in Takanashi by the relationship between the size of the logical screen and the size of the first rectangle displayed on the screen to represent the logical screen. This size relationship is shown in Fig. 3A of Takanashi and is defined by the height ratio and width ratio between the sizes of the logical screen and the display screen. The actual size of the logical screen 4 is shown on the right side of Fig. 3A as X-Y and the display screen 2 on the left side of Fig. 3A has a size X’-Y’ (see col. 2, lines 34-43 of Takanashi). However, this relationship in size between the logical screen 4 and the display screen 2 disclosed by Takanshi can not be considered to be the “relation between the cursor location on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view”, as recited in independent claim 1.

Regarding the limitation of independent claim 1 reciting “displaying continuously the cursor and only a part of a virtual view on the display”, the Examiner indicates that this is disclosed by the third paragraph of claim 1 of Takanashi, starting with “moving the second rectangle” and col. 1, lines 9-21 of Takanshi. The latter section of Takanshi describes the prior art to Takanashi and explains that a part of the logical screen is displayed and continuously moved toward a desired location. However, as explained above, the display of a part of the logical screen 5, 5’ and the moving of the rectangle 7, 9 do not occur simultaneously in

Takanashi. Rather, the display screen 2 of Takanashi changes states between a first state showing the part of the logical screen 5, 5' and a second state showing the rectangles 6, 7, 9.

Regarding the limitation of independent claim 1 that recites “changing the displayed part of the virtual view on the display in response to user scrolling actions”, the Examiner indicates that this limitation is disclosed by the second paragraph of claim 1 of Takanashi starting with “changing the display on the physical screen to a first rectangle related to the size of the logical screen...”. As discussed above, that relationship disclosed by Takanashi is based on ratios between the heights and widths of the logical screen 4 and the display screen 2. Moreover, the transformation of a rectangle size based on such ratios has nothing to do with a user scrolling action. Accordingly, the Examiner-referenced portions of Takanashi fail to disclose “changing the displayed part of the virtual view on the display in response to user scrolling actions”, as recited in independent claim 1.

Regarding the limitation of independent claim 1 which recites “determining continuously a relation between the cursor location on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view”, the Examiner indicates that this limitation is disclosed by the second paragraph of claim 1 of Takanashi, starting with “changing the display on the physical screen to a first rectangle related to the size of the logical screen...”. However, as explained above, that portion of Takanashi teaches only the ratios between the logical screen size and the display size and fails to teach or suggest the claimed “determined relationship”.

For all of the above reasons, the rejection of independent claim 1 as anticipated by Takanashi should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 8 and 15 include limitations that are similar to the above limitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 8 and 15 should be allowable for the same reasons as is independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, and 22-23 are allowable for at least the same reasons as are independent claims 1, 8, and 15, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any additional fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: April 1, 2009